DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 320 882 SP 032 436

AUTHOR Brown, Laurence D.
TITLE A Perspective on the Ph.D.-Ed.D. Discussion in Schools of Education.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 17-20, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Viewpoints (120) -- Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Standards; *Degree Requirements; *Doctoral Degrees; Doctoral Programs; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Labor Market; Literature Reviews; *Professional Recognition
IDENTIFIERS *Doctor of Education; *Doctor of Philosophy

ABSTRACT

This paper addresses the recommendation made by a recent study that the Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) degree be rejected as the graduate degree in education and the corollary of this recommendation, that the Doctor of Education degree (Ed.D.) be the standard degree for advanced study in education. This paper reviews data on trends in the incidence of the degrees, describes some findings on comparisons between the two degrees over the years, and argues that there are at least three factors related to degree choice which may interfere with any effort by the profession to move toward a single degree, particularly if that degree should be the Ed.D. These three factors are the reopening of the marketplace for doctoral graduates in education, the popularity of the Ph.D. with students and faculty, and the expanding knowledge base in the field. This case relies heavily on a previous study which attempted to view some of the issues from the perspective of different stakeholders: alumni, students, and faculty, as well as program administrators. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED320882

A Perspective on the Ph.D.-Ed.D. Discussion In Schools of Education

by

Laurence D. Brown

Indiana University

Presented at AERA Convention

Boston, Massachusetts

April 1990

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L. D. Brown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 032 436

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

My understanding is that an impetus for this symposium emerged from certain recommendations made by Professors Geraldine Clifford and James Guthrie in their book, Ed School: A Brief for Professional Education, published over a year ago. Of particular interest is their recommendation to "reject the doctor of philosophy as the graduate degree in education" (p. 358). The corollary, of course, to this recommendation is the promotion of the doctor of education degree (the Ed.D.) as the standard degree for advanced study in education. This very forthright, clear, and well argued recommendation is the most recent in a very long history of efforts to understand and clarify the need for and distinctions between these two degrees.

Of course, Ed. School is much more than a discussion of the relative merits and problems of two degrees. It deals with many of the problems of Schools, Colleges, and Departments of Education (SCDE's) trying to survive and thrive as academic units within the university context and at the same time serving the education profession in ways that it should or could. They argue that SCDE's do neither very well. Their recommendation in support of the Ed.D. as the proper degree for professional educators is only one of several. It may be a little unfair to isolate it, removing it from the context developed by the authors.

In my presentation I shall briefly review data on trends in the incidence of the degrees, describe some findings on comparisons between the two degrees over the years, then argue that there are at least three factors related to degree choice which may interfere with any effort by the profession to move toward a single degree, particularly if that

degree should be the Ed.D. These three factors are the re-opening of the marketplace for doctoral graduates in education, the popularity of the PhD with students and faculty, and the expanding knowledge base in the field. In making this case, I shall rely heavily on a study that some colleagues and I did about five years ago which attempts to view some of the issues from the perspective of different stakeholders, particularly alumni, students, and faculty as well as program administrators (Schneider et al., 1985).

A Brief History

Lawrence Cremin in his Hunt Lecture at the 1978 Convention of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education dated the first Ph.D. in education to be granted in 1893 at Teachers College, Columbia University (Cremin, 1978). The first Ed.D. was awarded at Harvard University in 1920 and then in 1934 Teachers College granted its first Ed.D. degree. It is interesting to note that those dates reveal that Teachers College managed with a single degree for more than 40 years and that the profession managed with only the Ph.D. for 27 years prior to the first Ed.D. The number of degrees, however, was clearly not large during that time period, in fact, trivial. It is also interesting to note that one of the most cited early references to problems associated with the distinction between the two degrees was written by Frank Freeman in 1931, only eleven years after the issuance of the first Ed.D. degree (Freeman, 1931).

Incidence of the Degrees

Cremin also notes in his Hunt Lecture that by 1941 the number of

Ed.D.s conferred had grown to equal the number of Ph.D.s. Since that time a variety of surveys have been conducted which, among other things, gathered data on the relative production of graduates with each degree. The first of these which I was able to identify was conducted in 1946 by Clifford Woody (Woody, 1946), followed by three surveys sponsored by the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in 1960 (Brown & Slater, 1960; Moore, Russell & Ferguson, 1960), 1966 (Brown, 1966), and 1971 (Robinson & Sistler, 1971), and two which I will mention later conducted in the eighties.

In an AACTE-sponsored survey of institutions and graduates from 1956 to 1958 it was indicated that of more than 3,000 graduates during that two year period, 34% earned the Ph.D. (Brown & Slater, 1960; Moore et al., 1960). In a second survey of graduates for the 1963-1964 academic year 34.1% earned the PhD (Brown, 1965). The four year period encompassed in a third AACTE-sponsored survey showed an increase from 1965 to 1969, from 35% to 41% earning the Ph.D (Robinson and Sistler, 1971). The "Dean's Network Study" published in 1985 (Schneider et al., 1985) sampled students and recent alumni of 42 large research-oriented institutions identified as highly productive in the Clark-Guba study (1977). In that group of 74.1% of the alumni held a Ph.D. and 81% of the students were pursuing it. Furthermore, the more prestigious the school the greater the proportion of students pursuing the Ph.D. This more limited sample overestimates the proportion of PhD's from all institutions, but not by much. In the 1956-58 survey these same institutions produced 41% PhD's as opposed to 34% for all institutions.

Thus, it appears that the first twenty years in the life of the Ed.D. it grew from zero to match the Ph.D. in frequency. The trend in favor of the Ed.D. continued into the 1950s, stabilized for at least a decade, then in the late 1960s began to decline. Sometime in the late seventies the proportion of Ph.D. holders overtook the Ed.D. recipients and today the Ph.D. clearly appears to be the dominant degree.

One might argue from these data that the Ed.D. had its day in the sun. It was the preferred degree, the degree of choice, but it did not remain so. The explanation for this trend is not clear, although speculations abound.

While in the surveys of the late fifties and sixties the proportion of Ed.D.s was two to one, there were very few specializations within education that reflected this distribution of degree recipients. Even in the fifties, educational psychology, counseling, and counseling psychology, social and philosophical foundations consistently produced a high proportion of students with Ph.D.s (80% to 90%) while administration, curriculum, elementary and secondary education consistently produced a very small proportion of Ph.D. graduates (10% to 20%). This particular breakdown of student data was not reported in the "Dean's Network Study" but one would suspect the same areas would show similar trends although significantly less pronounced.

Similarly with institutions, the two to one ratio of Ed.D.'s to Ph.D.'s seldom occurred. In institutions which offered both degrees one nearly always dominated over the other. For example in a study of 1956-1958 graduates Teachers College Columbia University was the largest

producer with over 500 doctorates of which more than 80% were Ed.D.'s. On the other hand for the second largest producer, New York University, the ratio was two to one in favor of the Ph.D. Indiana University showed 90% Ed.D.'s as did Stanford, but Michigan produced 90% Ph.D.'s. A significant number of schools had only a single degree program, which could be either the Ph.D. as in the case of Ohio State, or the Ed.D. as in the case of Harvard University. There seemed also to be a general trend for schools initiating study at the doctoral level to begin with the Ed.D. degree only, and I believe that is true today.

There are schools of education that offered only the Ph.D. in the fifties as well as currently, and this group includes some of the most prestigious schools of education. These schools and colleges of education make no claim that practitioners are unwelcome in their programs. It is quite likely that the requirements for a Ph.D. in school administration in those institutions may differ little from the Ed.D. in school administration from the school of education that offers both degrees. No apologies for this apparent anomalous situation is likely to be forthcoming from either institution.

The Ed.D. of course is not the only professional degree. It seems, however, that when the matter is discussed comparisons are inevitably with the M.D. and the J.D. and perhaps the M.B.A. There have been numerous other kinds of attempts with advanced graduate degrees other than the Ph.D. Most have not really succeeded. An example in recent years was the effort by a number of universities described by Dressell and DeLisle (1972) described efforts to develop the doctor of arts

degree (D.A.), a degree less than the Ph.D., designed for undergraduate teachers in a variety of disciplines. Another example in psychology is the Psy.D. designed again for the practitioner in psychology. This degree has had some success in particularly free-standing schools of psychology but little success within the university setting. Another example is the doctor of business administration (D.B.A.), a degree which thrived for a number of years in a variety of institutions including Indiana University. It still thrives at some. The experience of most business schools, however, when the Ph.D. became available in business was that students rapidly abandoned the D.B.A. program transferring to the Ph.D. program.

Structural Differences in the Two Degrees

In this and the next section structural and contextual characteristics of the two degree programs will be described and discussed. By structural characteristics is meant such common features of doctoral programs as language requirements, "foundations" requirements, requirements in the area of research methodology, the dissertation, residency, etc. On the other hand contextual characteristics refer to the events, experiences, and personal or institutional conditions under which the degree was pursued. These conditions include such considerations as the perceived goals of the program, the contribution of assistantships, interaction with faculty and students, and the experience of doing and defending the dissertation.

Since concern about lack of distinction between the two degrees can be dated at least back to 1931 (Freeman, 1931) it would be surprising if

striking differences were to appear in more fairly recent surveys, and of course they do not (see Table I).

A characteristic of this table is that the data were reported by current and former students. In my occasional work in this area I learned that there are multiple perspectives on graduate study in education. The failure to recognize and tap these perspectives may lead to erroneous analyses and faulty conclusions. The experience of students may contradict written school policy or that expressed by administrators of graduate studies. Most of the studies of doctoral programs have looked only at written policy or the testimony of doctoral program administrators. Experience of students and may differ. Likewise the experience of faculty from the different graduate programs within the school may differ from each other and from the perspective of students. The values, goals, and attitudes of these groups are important determinants of the kinds of policy changes that can be made successfully.

It is also very easy for us to think of the School of Education as a unitary organization and of graduate study in education as a single entity but in fact it is not. The School of Education very often is a holding company for a diverse set of graduate programs. This diversity is part of the problem adding significant complexity to such recommendations as rejecting the doctor of philosophy degree as the primary graduate degree in education.

Tables I and II tend generally to verify what has been demonstrated several times in a number of investigations. The language requirement

while diminishing remains a part of many Ph.D. programs. While one might expect differences between the degrees with regard to the research requirements, it does not show up, at least in the presence versus the absence of the requirement. The Ed.D. program may be somewhat more tightly structured as evidenced by a higher proportion of requirements in foundations and cognates. One might expect a difference in the practicum or internship requirement but in fact there is none, and at the same time there is some evidence of a trend toward greater emphasis on practicum work as part of both programs. When faculty reports are compared with student reports there appear to be discrepancies relative to the psychological foundations requirement, the cognate and the internship. Please note the general lack of distinction in the degrees with regard to the residency requirement.

Table I

Structural Requirements in Doctoral Programs
as reported by Ph.D. and Ed.D. Students and Alumni -

	Ph.D. %	Ed.D. %
Foreign Language*	30.0	5.5
Research Methods	91.5	92.6
Social Foundations	58.4	81.3
Psychological Foundations	54.2	81.3
Cognate within the School	42.0	63.8
Cognate outside the School	45.8	51.2
Internship or Practicum	39.7	42.9
Dissertation	94.2	93.2
Residency	89.4	95.2

*For Ph.D. alumni, 37.9% reported a language requirement, as opposed to 23.2% of current students.

Table II

Structural Requirements in Doctoral Programs
as reported by Students and Faculty

Requirements	Students %	Alumni %	Faculty %
Foreign Language	15.9	29.7	14.7
Research Methods	92.2	89.7	92.8
Social Foundations	61.9	68.4	61.8
Psychological Foundation	52.5	58.6	68.9
Cognate within the School	46.7	39.8	57.6
Internship or Practicum	41.6	37.9	52.3
Dissertation	93.3	93.3	*
Residency	83.8	90.5	*

*Question not posed to faculty

An additional structural factor not included in the tables is the qualifying examinations. These are required of approximately 95% of students and alumni with no significant difference between the degree holders.

We also asked students and faculty to indicate the relative importance of these program characteristics. One characteristic which might be expected to distinguish between Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s is the residence requirement. As noted in Table 1 the difference between degree holders was not particularly large with 95.2% of the Ed.D.'s reporting a requirement compared with 89.4% of the Ph.D.'s. Neither did the degree holders differ in their valuing of the residence requirement. We asked if they considered it to be important to be a full time student, and

there were some interesting contrasts. First, only 40% of the faculty described the residency as "very important." Sixty-one percent of the alumni considered it to be "very important" but only 47% of current students agree. Perhaps the retrospective view of alumni should be given significant weight.

When the dissertation experience is separated out Ph.D.'s proved to be slightly but not significantly more positive than the Ed.D.'s. Ninety-five percent of the alumni described dissertation work as "very positive" in its contribution to their professional development. For current students this figure was 89.6%.

In general these structural differences again confirm other studies that show that the difference in programs are slight and that these slight differences are diminishing, but at the same time some of the theoretical distinctions between the degrees are in evidence.

Contextual Characteristics of the Two Degrees

By contextual characteristics I am referring to matters less dictated by policy and regulations. Certain qualitative features of doctoral study that are seen as related to quality and general worthwhileness of the program. These include elements like intellectual climate, colleageality among students, student-faculty interaction outside of courses, value of assistantships, the dissertation experience, and perceived goals of the program.

Faculty collectively felt that the intellectual climate of the program was the most important quality indicator for the doctoral program. Students were not posed a comparable question but were asked

how satisfied they were with the intellectual demands and content of the courses within their program, in comparison with those within the school and courses outside the school. Seventy-five percent felt that the intellectual content and demands within their unit were "superior." Faculty also felt that an index of quality was the extent which they were viewed as on the forefront of knowledge within their field. Less than 40% of the students viewed their faculty as at that point. The degree holders did not differ in the extent to which they felt the intellectual demands were important, or perceived as present in their program.

A series of questions regarding program context was posed to students in form of rating scales indicating the relative contribution of each item to their "professional development." These results are reported in Table III. In comparing the responses of the Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s the Ph.D.s seem to be considerably more positive about the contribution of independent reading, slightly more positive about the contribution of teaching assistantships and qual preparation, but considerably less certain about the contribution of interaction with advisors and other faculty than were Ed.D.'s. Interestingly both groups rated more highly interaction with other faculty than with advisors. Not on this table but data from other sources indicate that alumni in retrospect view faculty-student interaction significantly more highly than current students (56.6% to 39.6%).

Table III

Contribution of Various Program Characteristics
To One's Professional Development
as seen by Ph.D.s and Ed.D.s

	Ph.D.		Ed.D.	
	Strongly Positive %	Positive %	Strongly Positive %	Positive %
Independent reading	38.1	21.0	23.6	25.5
Dissertation work	53.9	38.9	45.1	46.6
Research Assistantships	39.7	39.5	39.3	36.2
Teaching Assistantships	21.1	21.5	16.3	10.1
Preparation for Quals	23.2	19.1	18.7	15.6
Interaction with Advisor	25.7	50.3	35.6	47.5
Interaction with Other Faculty	45.9	40.4	54.3	36.2
Interaction with Students	37.7	51.3	36.5	52.5
Interaction with Mentor	38.1	50.0	38.6	48.5
Dissertation Defense	51.7	27.6	51.7	27.6

One area of questioning did produce striking differences between the degree holders or pursuers and between those and faculty. These differences also relate to the theoretical distinctions between the two degrees. The question posed was "given a list of occupational goals emphasized by the program how would you rate the degree of emphasis given each." The goals listed were: the production of "university professors emphasizing research," "university professors emphasizing teaching," "public school personnel," "government service," "clinical or social service." Assuming that goals of producing university professors are biased toward the Ph.D. while the rest may be biased somewhat toward the Ed.D., to what extent do the data support the distinction? A look at

Table IV would suggest very clearly that faculty support Ph.D. type goal by a significant margin over the Ed.D. type goals, but seem also to provide substantial for them all. On the other hand students are strikingly different from faculty in the extent to which they see strong emphasis on these different goals. Alumni differ from the students only in more often seeing emphasis on the production of university professors who teach. When students and alumni are regrouped by the degree that they have earned or are pursuing, the theoretical distinction between the Ph.D. and the Ed.D. gets considerable support (see Table V). 49.9% of the Ph.D. students see in their programs the goal of producing research

Table IV
Occupational Goals of Doctoral Study which are Strongly Emphasized as seen by Students, Alumni and Faculty

Occupational Goals	Students %	Alumni %	Faculty %
University Professor, emphasizing research	44.1	44.0	91.7
University Professor, emphasizing teaching	29.5	41.2	87.7
Public School Personnel	41.6	38.9	74.7
Government Service	3.3	3.0	59.3
Clinical or Social Service	7.1	5.1	48.2

Table V
Occupational Goals of Doctoral Study
Which are Strongly Emphasized as Perceived by
Ph.D. and Ed.D. Students

Occupational Goals	Ph.D. %	Ed.D. %
University Professors, emphasizing research	49.9	27.9
University Professors, emphasizing teaching	37.0	38.7
Public School Personnel	30.0	50.5
Government Service	4.6	1.3
Clinical or Social Service	8.3	3.4

oriented university professorship while only 27.9% of the Ed.D.'s see that as the goals while 30% of the Ph.D. students as contrasted with 50.5% of the Ed.D. students see the production of public school personnel as the goal of the doctoral program. Since the evidence of similarity of the degree programs is overwhelming, clearly the difference in perceived program emphasis is in the eye of the beholder. Perhaps one way of interpreting these data is that the program goals as developed by the institution and its faculty, and presumably reflected in the curricula, are less significant than the goals that students have for themselves in the program. The program is a means to their ends, and the same program may well serve quite diverse goals.

A conclusion which we drew as a result of our latest work is that doctoral programs in schools of education are structurally well within

the tradition of doctoral programs throughout the university. There is a definite bias toward producing scholars in the various subfields of education, the criticisms regarding an inadequate knowledge base for scholarly inquiry and the need to produce well trained professionals not withstanding. The emphases are clearly on the acquisition of research skills, the importance of qualifying examinations, the intellectual climate of the program, the quality of the dissertation, etc. All of these are important characteristics of Ph.D. programs in any field. It is also the case that of the 42 institutions we studied, nine very prestigious institutions have only Ph.D. programs. Only one has only an Ed.D. program. Even with this obvious bias toward very traditional appearing Ph.D. programs, students pursuing the Ed.D. do not differ greatly from Ph.D. students in their evaluation of the contextual and structural features of their doctoral study to any significant extent. Both groups seem satisfied with the program that they are in or have completed. The extent to which this is true was seen in Table III, even though there appears to be a slight difference between the Ph.D.'s and Ed.D.'s in the extent to which they highly rate their dissertation work. And when one combines the strongly positive category with the positive category that difference disappears.

Faculty Data

Faculty of the research oriented schools of education which we studied emerged from both kinds of degree programs, and a look at the kind of data resulting from a comparison of those two groups would seem to have bearing on this symposium topic.

The distribution of the faculty shows that 68.5% had the Ph.D. degree and 31.5% the Ed.D. Thus the distribution of doctorates among the faculty shows a lower proportion of Ph.D.s than among the current students but much higher than the production ratio at the time most faculty received their degrees. Viewed by rank 63.7% full professors have the Ph.D. while 78.0% of the assistant professors have the Ph.D., providing further support for the trend toward the Ph.D. Looking at faculty in relation to the program area to which they are assigned, only in elementary education and administration did the majority of faculty have the Ed.D. degree. Teacher education faculty also showed a high proportion of Ed.D.s, although less than half. Some but far from all of the research/practitioner kinds of distinctions are in evidence. For example, faculty with Ed.D.s were much less likely to have limited teaching assignments; they were much less likely than Ph.D.s to see an original contribution to knowledge as the goal of dissertation; and they were less likely to describe pre-dissertation research experience for doctoral students as very important. Relative productivity of Ed.D. and Ph.D. faculty in published research articles over the last five years was apparent by a statistically significant amount. But in fact, the difference over a five year period does not appear overwhelming with the Ph.D.s producing 15.4 publications as opposed to 14.2 for Ed.D.s. This is a finding which incidentally supports faculty productivity results reported by Ducharme and Agne in studying a somewhat different sample of institutions (1982).

Ed.D. faculty were nearly as likely to be the directors or principle

investigators of externally funded projects and they did not differ from Ph.D.s in seeing the goals of doctoral study as the production of university professors. In fact, both the Ph.D. and Ed.D. faculty place significant and similar values on a production of public school personnel, government service and social service personnel and well as the production of university professors. As faculty of research oriented institutions they simply did not seem to see compelling need for highly differentiated programs for students going into applied professional work and those likely to pursue research careers. This finding was corroborated by a study by Anderson reported in the Journal of Teacher Education (1983) who concludes that presumably there is a great deal of overlap in the basic knowledge and competencies needed to function as a researcher or as a practitioner. It was apparent from their data that in general graduates of both programs are prepared to operate in either capacity (p. 58). One of the deans interviewed as a part of the "Dean's Network Study" asserted that "the best training for the practitioner is as a scholar."

Data from this study, regardless of whether the source is faculty, students alumni, or deans, underscore the popularity of the Ph.D. degree. Even Ed.D. students enrolled in programs clearly biased toward Ph.D.-type goals find little fault with their programs. The data also suggest that the popularity has been increasing consistently for more than two decades. Efforts to reverse this trend could well encounter enormous resistance on the part of both students and faculty at least at the level of the profession in general. At the level of a specific institution,

and its policies governing doctoral study, institutional circumstances could provide the leverage for bringing about such change. These data suggest that such cases would be exceptions.

The MarketPlace

The importance of the marketplace is closely related, I believe, to attitudes toward the two degrees. It seems to me that Clifford and Guthrie are not really considering the marketplace at all in their arguments in regard to the Ph.D.

Dill and Morrison in a 1985 article in the Review of Higher Education argue strongly for distinction between the two degrees in the field of higher education. The reasons these authors cite are connected first of all to the statement issued by the Association of Graduate Schools in 1979 which defined Ph.D. programs in part in contrast to professional degree programs as follows: "Ph.D. programs lead the student to focus on what he or she can do to the subject; professional degree programs are more concerned with what the student can do with the subject" (p. 3).

Dill and Morrison accept the idea that their graduates will be doing more with than to the subject. Another reason they cite include the changing clientele in their field of higher education. It seems that the majority of their students are employed staff or faculty seeking a terminal degree. This reason in turn is tied to another, an ethical one regarding the surplus of doctorates in higher education and their improbability of becoming faculty in departments of higher education. I interpret these as market arguments which may be valid now but may not be

valid in the future if the market changes, and may or may not support a move to the Ed.D.

A primary motivation behind the rash of surveys in the late fifties and early sixties was a concern that there would be a severe shortage of faculty as the post-war population boom hit the colleges beginning in the middle sixties. They were interested in encouraging doctoral study particularly by improving the conditions under which doctoral study was undertaken. Their concern was well-founded. It was during the sixties that schools of education found it necessary to increase their staff by very significant numbers to meet market demands. In the early seventies when the population wave passed and enrollment in public schools reduced dramatically, many schools of education not only stopped hiring but in many cases began significantly reducing the size of their faculties. Now looking ahead into the nineties, the sixties faculty will be retiring and, while a student boom of the order of the sixties is unlikely, there will be a significant need to replace retiring faculty as undergraduate teacher education programs enjoy a significant recovery. Note also that the production of doctoral degrees in the field of education has declined significantly over the past 10 years. Given these factors plus the current reality of universities and their reward systems, is it likely that schools of education are going to be willing to employ faculty without regard to the degree they hold? Will students as they see opportunities open up in academia perceive both degrees as equally attractive? Overwhelming data showing no difference between degree requirements may well not be sufficient for universities to view

prospective talent without regard to their degree, nor students to elect programs without regard to the label on their diploma. In my opinion the universities and the schools of education will want people who see themselves as knowledge producers at least as much as they want faculty who are competent practictioners. Most probably they will want both.

Although the market does not change rapidly, it does change. Within my professional life I have seen it closed, opened, closed and reopening at both the public school and the university levels. It is quite likely that those entering the profession at this time may well have the same experience. A prudent goal for potential graduate students may be to select the degree program which holds open the greater number of options. I suspect in the arena of professional practice few are turned down because the degree they hold is a Ph.D. But the converse may not be true. One can argue this even though the programs are poorly differentiated. It is interesting to note, however, that the students and alumni represented in our data do not fault the programs for lack of differentiation, for overemphasis on research, for valuing the goal of producing university professors in doctoral programs, for placing great emphasis on the quality of dissertation, for continuing to support residence requirements and all those other nettlesome things which would seem to have little value for the practitioner.

It is quite probable that any individual who is entertaining the idea of advanced graduate study in some branch of education does not fully understand the Ed.D. degree. At some level they know what a Ph.D. is. In addition, their goals when entering the doctoral program may well

be phrased in practitioners' terms. They may want to accomplish something in the profession, work with a certain kind of social agency, or with a certain kind of problem group. That is to say many, perhaps most, enter graduate study with practitioners' goals in mind but then as their study progresses their goals may well change. From the point of view of the student, asking them to choose at the outset among two significantly differentiated programs may well be posing a very unfair question in a manner destined to restrict options.

The Importance of the Knowledge Base

Another point made by Dill and Morrison (1985) in their discussion of the need for a distinction between the degrees is that the increased sophistication and variety of research methods and techniques in the social and behavioral sciences may well provide the potential for distinguishing between the degrees on the research dimension of the programs. This is an interesting idea. They cite techniques used in decision sciences in business schools as more relevant to their students than the psychologically biased statistical techniques normally a part of school of education curricula. But is this a useful criterion for distinguishing between the degrees? That it is not is argued in an article by Carpenter (1987), and I tend to agree. There seems to be little question that the research methodologies and techniques in the social sciences are much more varied and sophisticated than those available 20 years ago. Quantitative techniques have been refined, and through computer use can analyze extremely complex data sets. The rise in the interest in qualitative methodologies has led to numerous new and

refined techniques for educational inquiry. These methods and techniques are making it possible to address questions not feasible to pursue a few years ago. The total effect of the availability of new techniques and technologies, combined with an increase in the number and variety of social science researchers who are investigating educationally relevant problems, is leading to significant increases in the knowledge base in the field of education. I believe the knowledge base in education is expanding rapidly. If so, and if the tools through which to continue to add to the knowledge base are expanding as well, is this the time to consider doing away with the very degree for which that is the goal? I for one do not think so.

The field of education may be closer that it has ever been to having a knowledge base adequate to support and defend education as a discipline. This is a time to encourage, not discourage, those entering advanced graduate work to consider inquiry as a primary goal of their doctoral program.

I think I understand the bleak and discouraging picture painted by Clifford and Guthrie of the plight of schools of education, but I am not convinced by their work that the picture of education schools is as general as they imply. Certainly the investigation done by the Schneider team, of which I was a part, did not find in the attitudes and feelings of deans, faculty and students, the kind of institutional malaise, pessimism and impotence suggested in Ed School. In many cases it was quite the opposite. Respondents felt their schools of education were quite secure within their institutions. The students were pleased with

their programs and with themselves in relation to or in comparison with other programs and units on campus. The faculty felt themselves to be competitive, and in fact appeared to be quite productive relative to most institutional standards. This is not to say, however, that some institutions were not experiencing extreme difficulty. Some were. In fact some of those having the greatest difficulties were among our most prestigious schools. Some were fighting for their very existence. On the other hand, I believe those of us involved in this piece of research would all agree that this was not the general case.

Perhaps more relative to the question being addressed today is to what extent would the problems confronting some of the more troubled schools of education be relieved by giving up the Ph.D. and promoting the Ed.D. While such a move might be supported by certain factions within these institutions, I do not believe it would be viewed favorably by faculty or by students. Nor do I believe it would be generally viewed by other units within the institution as a move in the direction of greater academic or professional progress.

Conclusions

To summarize briefly, I would first of all add that for a significant number of years the Ed.D. was, in fact, the dominant degree in the field of education. For a variety of reasons, many of which are traceable to changes in other disciplines, the Ph.D. became more accessible and has become the favored degree. Secondly, I see little dissatisfaction of a general sort with the fact that the Ph.D. is the more popular degree. Neither deans, faculty nor current or past students

seem dissatisfied with their doctoral programs even though they recognize the research bias in the orientation of the programs. Thirdly, the doctoral programs of most institutions, whether they lead to the Ph.D. or the Ed.D., closely parallel the traditions of Ph.D. programs in most doctoral-producing institutions. Fourthly, the institutional marketplace is opening up. Faculty shortages are predicted later in this decade. My prediction is that if 80% of the current graduates are earning Ph.D.'s that the proportion of Ph.D.'s who will be employed by colleges and universities will be greater than 80%. Finally, and perhaps more importantly, in my opinion the knowledge base in many sub-areas within the field of education has grown to the point that the defense for offering the Ph.D. is stronger than it has ever been, and that the production of graduates capable of adding to that knowledge base is a goal that should be encouraged, not discouraged, by the profession.

References

Anderson, E. G. (1983). Differentiation of the Ed.D. and Ph.D. in education. Journal of Teacher Education, 34(3), 55-58.

Association of Graduate Schools (1979). The degree of doctor of philosophy: A statement of policy. Washington, D.C.: Author

Brown, L. & Slater, M. (1960) The doctorate in education: An inquiry into conditions affecting pursuit of the doctoral degree in the field of education. Vol. I - The graduates. Washington, D. C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Brown, L. (1966). The doctorate in education: Implications for the Preparation of College Teachers of Education. In Frontiers of Teaching, AACTE Yearbook (pp. 264-292).

Carpenter, D. S. (1987) On-going dialogue: degrees of difference. The Review of Higher Education. 10, No. 3, 281-286.

Clark, D., & Guba, E. G. (1977). A study of teacher education institutions as innovators, knowledge producers and change agencies. Final Report. (ERIC ED139805).

Clifford, G. J., & Guthrie, J. W. (1988). Ed school: A brief for professional education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cremin, L. A. (1978). "The education of the educating professions": 19th Charles W. Hunt Lecture. American Association for Colleges of Teacher Education, Chicago, 21 February 1978.

Dill, D. D., & Morrison, J. L. (1985). The Ed.D. and the Ph.D. research training in the field of higher education: A survey and a proposal. Review of Higher Education, 8, 169-186.

Dressell, P. L., & DeLisle, F. H. (1972). Blueprint for change: Doctoral programs for college teachers. Iowa City: American College Testing Program.

Ducharme, E. R. & Agne, R. M. (1982) The education professoriate: a research based perspective. Journal of Teacher Education, 23, no. 6, 30-36.

Freeman, F. N. (1931). Practices of American universities in granting higher degrees in education. 19th Year Book of the National Society of College Teachers of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Moore, H. E., Russell, J. H., & Ferguson, D. G. (1960). Doctorate in education: An inquiry into conditions effecting pursuit of the doctoral degree in the field of education, Vol. 2-The Institutions. Washington, D.C.: The American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Robinson, N., & Sistler, J. K. (1971). The doctorate in education: An inquiry into conditions effecting pursuit of the doctoral degree in the field of education-the institutions. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa

Schneider, B. L., Brown, L. D., Denny, T., Mathis, B. C., & Schmidt, W. (1985). The quality of the doctorate in schools of education: A final report to the Ford Foundation. Ford Foundation.

Woody, C. (1947) Requirements for the degrees of doctor of philosophy in education and the doctor of education: Monograph No. 1, The National Society of College Teachers of Education. Ann Arbor: The Ann Arbor Press.